Probability of God

How Hugh calculates probabilities is found at the following link:  
<http://www.reasons.org/blogs/average-joes-corner/is-probability-a-problem-for-rtb>

Within the last year, Hugh told me RTB had a skeptic come in to develop his  
own probabilities based on the available data. The skeptic came within 100x  
of RTB's calculations!! Amazing, since the last RTB-figured calculations  
came out to about 10 to the 654th power for almost 700 finely tuned  
parameters. The list now is probably over 1,000. 

Tim,   
Roger is trying to conduct a thought process that would give us the   
probability that God exists P(H).   
   
His unqualified statement "We can all agree that the probability we exist given God exist is one: P(X | H) = 1"   
is a fallacy because it tacitly assumes that God exists (or P(H) = 1), while we did not find out what is the probability   
that God exists yet. We know for certain that we exist, so if God did not exist the expression above would be 0.  
   
I am not insinuating here that Roger was trying to trick us, knowing that as Christians we will agree  
with him that P(X | H) = 1. It would be very naughty of him if he did it purposely.   
;-)  
We may believe in God's existence, having access to knowledge from other sources, but   
for the sake of the formal proof process, he was not allowed to make this assumption yet.  
   
The proper statement should be P(X | H) + P(X | ~H) = 1, which means "Given God exists we exist or given God  
does not exist - we exist". This is a true statement, since at this stage we don't know probability   
of God's existence. However, we know for sure is that we exist.  
   
So the final equation P(H | X) = P(H) / P(X) is only the consequence of Roger's fallacious premise. The probability   
that we exist is P(X) = 1 even though Roger says we cannot assign a value to it (anybody can tell me why?).   
   
We are left with: P(H | X) = P(H), which basically means that "Given that we exist God exist equals to God exist".   
Since Roger assumed at the beginning that P(H) = 1, we can conclude that P(H | X) = 1 too.   
   
This equation is met only because Roger had made a fallacious assumption that P(X | H) = 1 before knowing that  
God exists. In the process he neglected to consider the case what happens with us "Given that God does not   
exist" i.e. P(X | ~H) = ?